Confucius, who reconciled his moral philosophy with the traditional practices of Sinicreligion by presenting his ideas as the meaning of those rites. Praxis over belief was Toynbee's presentation of primitive religions. When the higher religions emerged, their novelty was the emphasis on belief over praxis. This led to what Toynbee refers to as the "paradox," that the greatest advances in religious thought were usually seen as lapses in religion by their founders' contemporaries. Thus the incredulity of Pompey when he found no object of worship in the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, and charges of atheism against early Christians by their pagan neighbors while the Jews denounced these same Christians as blasphemers.

The Superiority of Higher Religions

If these early Christians were not bound by the rituals of the either the Jews or the pagans, then what was their appeal? Likewise, how did the philosophy of Gautama Siddhartha become the Buddhist religion of today? In other words, what accounts forthe rise of the higher religions?

Toynbee seeks to place the rise of the four higher religions (Christianity, Islam, Mahayana and Hinduism) in his paradigm of civilizational breakdown. Thus, in general, the higher religions came out of the breakdown of the second generation of civilizations. These civilizations did not all break down at the same moment of history, so as the four higher religions emerged, they often took elements from prior religions and civilizations. For example, Christianity arose during the breakdown of the Hellenic civilization from both Jewish and Zoroastrian roots. The Zoroastrian rootmerged into Judaism during the Jews Babylonian exile, which occurred during the time of troubles that led to Cyrus founding the Achaemenian universal state. The earlier, Jewish roots of Christianity, arose out of the breakup of the "New Empire of Egypt" when Moses led the Hebrew internal proletariat away from that troubled land and founded their own parochial state.

Toynbee argues that religious developments are more likely to occur during a time oftroubles than during times of peace and prosperity. He goes so far as to call it a "law"that "the circumstances favourable to spiritual and to secular progress are not only different but are antithetical." His explanation will sound familiar to those familiar with the phenomenon of "no atheists in foxholes."

Spiritual and secular ideals are at variance; they are perpetually striving with one another for mastery over human souls; and it is therefore not surprising that souls should be deaf to the call of the Spirit in times of secular prosperity, and sensitive tothe neglected whisper of the still small voice when the vanity of the This World is brought home to them by secular catastrophes and when their hearts are softened bythe sufferings and sorrows that these catastrophes inflict.

Toynbee is obviously not only thinking of the past, but also of the post-WWII present:

When the house that Man has built for himself falls in ruin about his ears and he findshimself standing again in the open at the mercy of the elements, he also finds himself standing again face to face with a God whose perpetual presence is now no longer hidden from Man's eyes by prison walls of Man's own making.

If Toynbee seems to be saying that post-war Europe was in a time of troubles (whichincluded both World Wars), then he has hope for the future.

If this is the truth, the interregna which punctuate secular history by intervening between the submergence of one civilization and the emergence of a successor may beexpected to have, as their counterparts in religious history, no breaches of continuity or pauses in the pulsation of life, but flashes of intense spiritual illumination and bursts of fervent spiritual activity.

Religious insights come out of troubled times. Each troubled time is different, just associeties are individual even while they follow the same basic paradigm of rise and fall. Each civilization's troubles are unique, so each civilization's religious response will highlight a different facet of the Deity.

Toynbee has made a case for churches springing up out of a civilization's decay. Butmight things work the other way? Could churches have a role in creating new civilizations? Toynbee argues that they do, and an exploration of his ideas on the subject will further illuminate the importance of religion in human history.

Birth out of Death: Churches and the Creation of New Civilizations

If the universal state is already dying by the time a higher religion becomes a universal church, then what role does religion play in the funeral of the dead civilization and the birth of a new one? Toynbee's concept is that of the church as a chrysalis for new civilizations. Toynbee confesses that at one time, he believed that this was raison d'être for universal churches, but that when writing Volume VII, he had come to believe that universal churches had a much larger reason for existence. As mentioned before, it is obvious that the experiences of World War II had a significant effect in expanding Toynbee's appreciation of religion. Still, Toynbee admits that while the universal churches serve a much greater purpose than simply asa chrysalis for new civilizations, it is useful to study that facet of their mission. It is important to understand Toynbee's ideas regarding civilizational cycles and the role that religion plays in those cycles.

The Chrysalis Concept

Toynbee claims that all of the extant civilizations in 1952 were affiliated to earlier civilizations through universal churches. He traces the Western and Orthodox Christian civilizations back to the Hellenic civilization through Christianity; the Far East back to the Sinic through Mahayana; the Hindu back to the Indic; and the Arabicthrough Islam to the Syriac. He goes on to argue that the fossils of several extinct civilizations were preserved in a religious expression, for example, Judaism, Jainism and several offshoots of Buddhism.

The transition process from old civilization to new begins with what Toynbee calls the "conceptive" role of the church. In this phase, the universal state has been established out a time of troubles. The state has seized all political power and left the bulk of the population as an internal proletariat. They have willingly given up their freedom in exchange for peace and safety, but they have paid a price. This cost of freedom is frustration, a loss of that creative impulse that Toynbee calls "a psychic stream" and modern psychologists call "libido" by the alienated majority. This "life-force" will seek expression, and one way it does so is in new religions. Toynbee quotes Lord Macauley: "It [Christianity] excited all the passions of a stormy democracy in the quiet and listless population of an overgrown empire . . .it changed men, accustomed to be turned over like sheep from tyrant to tyrant, into devoted partisans and obstinate rebels."

In this first conceptive phase of the chrysalis, the state has suppressed the energies andcreativity of the masses. The successful new religions are those which can take those energies and use them to further their message. When the new religion is able to channel these unleashed energies, it enters the "gestative phase" of its encounter with the universal state. This is an institution-building phase of the religion's life cycle.
Toynbee compares this to the building of secular institutions that accompany the building of the civilization. The universal state is not using this creative energy, so thechurches appropriate it and provide an outlet to "those men of mark who have failed to find scope for their genius as public servants." Toynbee claims that at this stage, themasses sense that the state is sinking and are looking for some institution that promises them hope for the future, thus the gestative phase is marked by mass conversions. Toynbee provides examples from his second generation civilizations of the growth of the new higher religions. It is during this phase that civilization which gave birth to the religion completely "dissolves into a social vacuum." To illustrate his point, Toynbee uses an Islamic myth, which teaches that the bridge over Hell to Paradise is as narrow as a razor's edge. The avatar of the Prophet Mohammed appearsas a ram who will surefootedly cross the bridge with the true believers clinging to himas a tick in the ram's wool. Unbelievers are left to cross on their own, which they are unable to do, therefore falling into eternal damnation. The ram, representing the

universal churches, is the vehicle by which the benefits and learning of the prior civilization will cross the abyss between the old and new civilizations.

Once the old universal state is dead and gone, a new dynamic is needed. Toynbee calls this the "parturient" phase. During this phase, the church opens the floodgates and releases the energy it has been keeping within its own institutions during the deaththroes of the prior state. Church leaders are released to serve in secular roles, and new parochial states begin to build out of the creative energy stored by the religious institutions, responding to new challenges and beginning the whole Challenge- Response-Mimesis paradigm all over again. At least, that is the general idea. On this phase of his argument, Toynbee admits that the evidence breaks down. Unlike the neat examples he was able to provide for the first two phases of his paradigm, he admits that the evidence is not universal for the parturient phase. It worked in WesternEurope during the Medieval period and to a degree in India with the Brahmins, but notvery well with either Ottoman Orthodoxy or Islam. This leads Toynbee to discuss the inadequacy of the chrysalis concept.

The main drawback of the churches as chrysalis concept is that only works for one generation of civilizations. Going from the first generation to the second generation, Toynbee can only describe rudimentary higher religions. He says in fact that it "never occurred in the corresponding transition from the second generation from the first." (See Chart of Civilizations and Religions at conclusion of paper.) It is only after the second generation of civilizations that Toynbee can detect the emergence of universal churches. He attempts to delineate a group of secondary higher religions arising out ofthe third generation of civilizations (see Chart), but none of these secondary religions has truly taken hold in the way that the primary four higher religions did.

Toynbee admits that the chrysalis concept is very limited even looking at the second and third generations. Looking at his Chart, he comments that while all the tertiary civilizations came from secondary civilizations via chrysalis churches, not all the secondary civilizations parented tertiary civilizations. Only four of the eight secondary civilizations gave birth to a succeeding generation. He also admits that he did not see the cycle repeating in his own time. Writing after World War II, he does speculate as where Communism fits into his schema. He does call Marxian Communism a religion, speculating that if the Soviet Union was the universal state forthe Western World, then Communism would then be the religion of the dominant minority, and reap a reward of "Dead Sea fruit." In other words it would not triumph, but would languish as all dominant minorities do, waiting for their internal proletariatsto discover a vision of the divine that meets their needs, not the needs of their commissars.

In analyzing Toynbee's concept of the chrysalis, it appears to be even more limited that he thought it was. While Toynbee's list of tertiary civilizations makes sense, his secondary religions are purely derivative of the four higher religions (Christianity, Islam, Mahayana and Hinduism). Looking at this paradigm in 1998, it does not hold up. At least two of the four primary religions (Christianity and Islam) are continuing to win adherents around the globe, even as Western Christian Civilization (at least theWestern part, with or without the Christian) is becoming a global civilization.
Buddhism and Hinduism are continuing to hold their ground as major world religionsand have spread world wide as a result of increased global immigration. By contrast, while a some of his secondary religions such as Baha'ism and Sikhism are still in existence, they have not become major world religions and these two sects have beenseverely persecuted in their lands of origin (Iran and India).

Toynbee has discussed the function of churches in birthing civilizations, but what about the function of civilizations in birthing churches. If religion is as important tomankind as Toynbee came to believe that it did, what might be the role of secular institutions in illuminating the divine?

Civilization as an Egg to Hatch A New Religion

As Toynbee's conviction that religion was the overarching link between civilizations,both in time and space, grew after WWII, his writing in A Study of History, reflectedthat change. In the chapter discussed above, "Churches as a Higher Species of Society," Toynbee urged his readers to

"open our minds to the possibility that the churches might be the protagonists and thatvice versa the histories of the civilizations might have to be envisaged and interpretedin terms, not of the own destinies, but of their effect on the history of Religion."

In the next chapter, "The Role of Civilizations in the Lives of Churches," Toynbee asks the reader to invert the paradigm he used in the first six volumes. Instead of considering civilizations paramount and religion subordinate, he wants to "make thenew departure of dealing with civilizations in terms of churches." Toynbee believes that this approach will answer a question posed by Plato, "[w]hich . . . are the true catastrophes: the breakdowns of civilizations or their births?" Toynbee's answer is that the birth of a civilization is a catastrophe if it results in a regression from higher religion, but a success if the new civilization gives rise to a new church. Toynbee's example of a successful new church is Christianity, which took vocabulary and customs from the Hellenic (both Greek and Roman) culture and infused them with sacred significance. He uses the metaphor of an egg, which must be broken for the new life within to grow and mature. The Hellenic civilization existed for one reason,to bring forth Christianity. In so doing, its death was not in vain, but a life cycle

expended for a noble purpose. But what about the other side of the drachma, the casewhere a civilization does not give rise to a new church, but regresses back to a prior civilization?

Unsuccessful Civilizations

After Toynbee sets forth his example of the Christian church transforming the Hellenic world into a new entity, devoted to showing the divine light to the people, heconsiders whether a civilization which arose out of such a religious ethos might have regressed back to the level of its parent civilization. Using the same methodology of tracing word etymology from one source to another, Toynbee traces a number of words and customs from the church to a purely secular connotation. He concludes thatmuch of the sacred has reverted back to a purely secular meaning. In a revision of the normally accepted view, Toynbee views the so-called Renaissance as a regression of European civilization because it rejected the religious base of that society in favor of the secular works of the Hellenic civilization. He further claims that this is not merelya Western problem, but it has also occurred in the Far East, where the rejection of Mahayana in favor of the prior Sinic culture has been more complete than the rejection of Christianity in the West.

What causes this rejection? Why do societies reject the higher religions that Toynbee feels are clearly superior to any other choices they have? Toynbee seeks answers to these questions in the chapter, "Causes of Regression." He looks at the Hildebrandinepapacy, Saint Benedict and Pope Gregory the Great. He concludes that to the degree those in charge of the Civitas Dei get ensnared in the affairs of the world of men, their legacy is a degraded spirituality. He acknowledges that the three holy men he studies were not attempting to take worldly power for its own sake, but were forced into taking that power by the challenge of exercising their spiritual authority. Therefore hereasons that the real problem is not with the institutions per se. The real problem is innate in human nature, Original Sin.

If our problem is Original Sin, an intractable evil in the human soul, is there any hope of progressing either in terms of civilization or religion? Was the flowering of the fourhigher religions the apex of human development? Toynbee is very concerned with these questions in the chapter, "The Bow in the Cloud." The chapter title comes from the account in Genesis where God tells Noah that the rainbow is a sign to man that God will never again destroy the world by water. He reminds the reader that secular progress and spiritual progress are polar opposites, so if civilization has seen great secular advances, it is to be expected that the spiritual life of that society would have declined.

Looking at the Western World after both world wars, he offers two choices to the Western civilization: The first is to let the Neo-Paganism that almost destroyed the West in the twentieth century have its way and grind our civilization into the dust. Thesecond is for modern man to awake from his slumber, repent of his Man-worship and return to the higher religions revealed to his forefathers. Toynbee believes that one will end in the death of the West, the other offers a hope of new life.

Toynbee believed that the future of civilization depended on man's religious choicesand that our previous civilizations were merely a vehicle for the spiritual side of manto develop and flourish. It would seem from Volume VII that the only unit of study worth the historian's time or effort would be man's quest for God.

In fact, one might ask, given Toynbee's focus on religion as the prime element in civilization, why did Toynbee not just categorize his civilizations by their religions, instead of all the other criteria of space, time, etc. He answered that very question in an annex to Volume VIII, titled "The Relativity of the Unit of Classification to the Object of Study." He notes that the modern societies based on Christianity and Islam arose out of the same parent society at about the same time, and that both of them are apt to conjure up renaissances of the dead parent society. Why not treat them as the same society? Toynbee answers because they conjure up different aspects of the dead parent society in response to different challenges. So Toynbee returns to his Challengeand Response paradigm from the first three volumes. Even when societies have the same religion and the same heritage, each time and each place presents different challenges to the society and to grow and thrive, each society must respond creatively and appropriately, based on the need and capabilities of the moment. Likewise, when a society goes into breakdown, it will break down for reasons unique to its own time, its own failed challenges, and the course of that breakdown will be unique to that society. Even the universal churches that arise from the breakdown are not the same.
While Toynbee finds striking similarities between Christianity, Islam, Mahayana and Hinduism, they all have very unique features that met the challenges of their own times and places of origin.

The unit of study for a historian will always be bound by time and geography. While on one level, one could discuss only two second generation civilizations, the Syriac (Christian/Islam) and the Indic (Mahayana/Hindu), in fact, one would be painting withtoo broad a brush. One would have a unit of study that is so large that one could nevercatch hold of it. By necessity one would have to break it down by time or region just to look at a piece small enough to examine.

In discussing the history of large civilizations whether the Syriac and Indic of Toynbee, or the world systems of later world historians, one runs into the same problem. One must either skim the surface of many times and places, looking for a

very simple paradigm to organize history, or one can dive in to a specific time or place and look for patterns of history. While earlier twentieth century historians like
H. G. Wells or Toynbee wrote multi-volume works that purported to do both, in reality they failed. Even with twelve volumes, Toynbee could only cover a few timeperiods in the most superficial manner.

The later volumes of A Study of History become a polemic for what Toynbee sees as the gaping abyss facing Western man. He uses his paradigm of universal states, universal churches and proletariats to urge his readers to wake up and find God beforethe Western world kills itself in an orgy of violence. This teleological, even eschatological urgency overwhelms Toynbee. The urge to preach is an inherent one for the world historian. Toynbee is not the only twentieth century prophet who has used a world history to promulgate his individual gospel. H. G. Wells desired a world state. Oswald Spengler figured that the West was done for, but wanted to explain why.Pitirim Sorokin wanted everyone to shake off Sensate Culture and discover how to love each other. Immanuel Wallerstein wants us to see how we are bound by the Capitalist World-System so we can stop exploiting the periphery states and live in Marxist peace and harmony.

The question becomes, not if a world historian has an agenda, but why does the discipline appear to demand one. Arnold J. Toynbee can furnish us with one possible answer to this question. To study a very large unit, even one civilization at a specific time, one needs some kind of organizing device, a meta-narrative. The quest to study many civilizations over the course of human history requires not merely a meta- narrative, but an all encompassing vision of human existence. Religion can provide this kind of encompassing vision, as can pseudo-religious ideologies, such as Marxism. Religious visions whether of the overtly spiritual type, such as Christianity,or the putatively materialist variety, such as Marxism are by nature teleological. Theyhave a vision of where mankind is going and what awaits him at the end of his road.

Toynbee's vision is rooted in his Christianity. Even his universalist tendencies were rooted in the similarities between the other higher religions and Christianity. His vision of history is therefore by nature, religious. In a spiritually motivated view, Godor man's attempts to find God (religion), will be the organizing principle. It is not surprising that he changed course in his view of civilization between volumes VI and
VII. Given the calamity that was Europe during the fifteen year interregnum between those volumes, it would have been more surprising if there was no change in vision; because it would have meant that Toynbee had not been part of his world, not just as ahistorian, but as a human

Oral History: Revealing the Mind through Conversation

Ute Ferrier

In the United States the institutional beginnings of oral history can be traced back to Allan Nevins's Oral History Project at Columbia University in 1948. As a field it developed in the early 1980s and at this time advocates started to seriously reflect on its methods and implications. Today oral history and public history are considered thegrowth engine of the historical discipline, absorbing many historians who are competing in a tight job market. However, the importance of oral history goes beyond practical considerations. Its methodological innovations enhance yet at the same time challenge the discipline. In this paper I will discuss some of the key issues anyone who intends to "do" oral history ought to consider. While I will briefly address some of the methodological concerns, the main focus of the paper will deal with the meaning and implication of oral history.

Oral history, especially in its import on public history, has tremendous potential. It can give a voice to those who have previously been excluded from historical narratives. By incorporating everyday, ordinary people in the historical dialogue it gives them an opportunity to formulate their own meaning. A sharing of authority cantake place and through this grass roots approach the "making" of history can become more democratic. Approaching history from the bottom up also encourages that a newset of questions be asked, and it can break the old molds of historical scholarship in numerous ways.

Oral history has been practiced by professionals on both sides of the academic divide and has been used for diverse purposes, from purely academic information to statisticsutilized by government agencies. Oral history can be used as a supplement to traditional historical writings because it can offer a different type of source and therefore can be interpreted as a way of making more history. It has also been viewed as an alternative that allows scholars to get around the historical discipline altogether. For Michael Frisch, who has reflected on the craft and implication of oral history for two decades, these two visions of more history or no history are not entirely satisfactory. Oral history has a greater potential because it can make history more meaningful—it can be a qualitative improvement, it can make for better history.
Functioning within the realms of history, this approach can enrich an already extant knowledge base. It can also be more responsive and reciprocal than the history that is

written exclusively for an academic audience and lacks relevance for the public atlarge.

Even if oral history is conducted within institutional confines, it has potential to reachthe masses. In other words, oral history can be used for social and political purposes more readily than a monograph on an obscure study that is only interesting to a handful of scholars. Frisch sees the challenge of oral history in learning how "social history, community studies, and public presentation can combine in scholarship that is at once intellectually trenchant, politically meaningful, and sharable with the communities from which it comes."

Frisch's call for political sensitivity and the democratization of history has been echoed by many of his colleagues, including the British sociologist Paul Thompson whose work is driven by the tenet that "All history depends ultimately upon its social purpose." Thompson's activist, populist stance has inspired many historians who haveendeavored to let the common people participate in their histories and to give them a central place in it.

This sharing of authority and incorporation of commoners requires that the information be handled responsibly. In this respect an oral historian faces similar challenges than a historian who analyzes written documents. Both have to be sensitivein regards to their sources and consider who is speaking, what the people or documents reveal and what the historical context was under which the records were created. Oral historians have additional challenges; for example, how to reduce a tape-recorded interview to a written transcript, how to account for facial expressions, body language and pauses. Non-verbal clues get lost during transcription. The question of selectivity also plays an important role because recordings are not necessarily translated in their entirety, so there is considerable leeway to skew an interview by selecting certain answers and excluding others.

Information presents other problems as well, because memory and recall are subjective, which makes it all the more important to understand the context. Without context oral history would merely be swapping stories but "conversations become historical in the truest sense when a context is formed for the dialog." This can be challenging because often informants are interviewed about events that transpired some time ago. When recollections are not fresh they may be faulty and the events may be reconstructed in a distorted way. Having a temporal distance can sometimes be beneficial though, because it allows for greater reflection, which is hardly possiblewhile people are in the midst of the experience. However, since events recalled at a later date are interpreted in the mind-set of the present, this begs the question, "What time period does such an interview represent: the time investigated or the time of the interview?" All these matters need to be considered. It is important who is talking,